DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 440 CE 052 415

TITLE	Reauthorization of Expiring Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs. Volume 5. Adult Education. Hearing on H.R. 5, before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	26 Mar 87
NOTE	55p.; Serial No. 100-6. Some pages contain small, light type.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Basic Skills; Federal Legislation; *Functional Literacy; Functional Reading; *Literacy Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Adult Education Act; Congress 100th; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

These statements, letters, and supplemental materials were provided by: (1) Janet Jones Ballard, Assault on Literacy Program; (2) Representative Jim Cooper, Tennessee; (3) Mitch Snyder, Center for Creative Non-Violence; (4) Garrett Murphy, Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs, New York; (5) W. Wilson Goode, mayor of Philadelphia; and (6) Nicholas M. Nikitas, National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Most of the testimony focused on the problem of illiteracy. Also included are the findings of a mail survey conducted by the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. The survey's sample was 46 members of the association representing programs funded by the Adult Education Act. The response rate was 52 percent. The survey sought data on four reauthorization issues, with the following results: (1) as to whether the attainment of competencies should be included as a purpose of the act, 83 percent said yes; (2) as to whether the act should change the percentage of matching funds required from state or local programs, 40 percent said the match should be increased to 25 percent, 34 percent said it should not be changed, and 26 said it should become a 50 percent match; (3) as to whether the states should be required to fund only unique programs, the respondents were evenly divided; and (4) as to whether the act should require the conduct of periodic measurements of performance levels, 81 percent said yes and 68 percent said the act's funding formulas should be based on those performance levels. (CML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306440

REAUTHORIZATION OF EXPIRING FEDERAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Adult Education

Volume 5

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 5

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC ON MARCH 26, 1987

Serial No. 100-6

Printed for use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
78-416 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

CE 052 445

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC on March 26, 1987	1
Statement of:	
Ballard, Janet Jones, Assault of Illiteracy Program	11
Cooper, Hon. Jim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee	3
Murphy, Garrett, director, Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs, New York State Education Department	19
Synder, Mitch, Center for Creative Nonviolence, Washington, DC	19
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, et cetera:	
Ballard, Janet Jones, Assault on Illiteracy Program:	
Executive summary	14
Finalized statement	15
Cooper, Hon. Jim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee, statement of	5
Goode, W. Wilson, mayor, City of Philadelphia:	
Letter to Chairman Hawkins, dated April 9, 1987	38
Testimony of	39
Keeton, Patricia M., legislative representative, AAACE, Life Skills Division, report submitted by	48
Murphy, Garrett W., director, Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs, New York State Education Department, executive summary	22
Nikitas, Nicholas, M., National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Washington, DC, testimony of	42

H.R. 5, SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACT, ADULT EDUCATION ACT

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1987

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Hawkins, Williams, Martinez, Sawyer, Solarz, Petri and Grandy.

Staff members present: John F. Jennings, counsel; Nancy L. Kober, legislative specialist; Beverly Griffin, staff assistant; Barbara Dandridge, legislative intern; Andrew Hartman, senior legislative associate; David Esquith, legislative associate; and Jo-Marie St. Martin, legislative associate.

Chairman HAWKINS. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education will come to order. Today we will be conducting an oversight hearing on the Adult Education Act. This programs expires at the end of fiscal year 1988, and will be reauthorized in the Omnibus Elementary and Secondary Education bill that our subcommittee will be marking up beginning on April 7th.

The Adult Education Act is the most important component in the federal government's efforts to reduce illiteracy. In approaching this reauthorization, we have the benefit of several hearings that the subcommittee held last Congress on the issue of illiteracy. I would like to see us expand this program to meet more of the adult illiterate population.

Congressman Goodling and I have been grappling with the problem of illiteracy for more than a year now. We have added language to other components of the larger reauthorization bill such as the Chapter 1 bill to help prevent illiteracy. However, I would particularly like to commend Congressman Williams for taking the initiative in the area of adult education in drafting legislation which I understand will be introduced very soon.

This morning also the Chair would like to announce that we will be giving out copies of a report entitled An Assessment of the Federal Initiative in the Area of Adult Literacy. The copies are available at the desk.

This report was done by the staff at my request, and it summarizes the findings of the analysis. Sometime ago before this commit-

tee statements were made concerning the various federal programs that apparently or allegedly were a part of the federal initiative in the area of adult literacy.

The implication was given that we are spending a substantial amount of money already on the problem, and consequently no further enhancement or expansion of the program was needed.

However, I think that the report will summarize the actual situation that does prevail, and I think that it certainly refutes the argument that we are generous already, over-generous already, in terms of reducing illiteracy.

The Chair is not going to get into the numbers today, whether or not 50, 60 or 70 million Americans are functionally illiterate. It is far too many whether we accept the lower estimate or the larger one.

We have used generally on this committee 60 million Americans which is about one-third of the adult population as being functionally illiterate. And I think that is a fairly safe estimate. And certainly, whether it were one-third of that amount, it would still be too many.

It is obviously undeniable that we do not rank very high as a nation in literacy. And whether we say it is 45th or maybe 15th, it is certainly true that we are not first, second or third, and that we have no right to brag too much about it or to be very much possessed of pride to the extent of the illiteracy in this nation.

It is for that reason that this committee is very much concerned about the problem, and we look forward to the witnesses that we have asked to testify this morning.

[Report referred to retained in Subcommittee files.]

Mr. Petri, do you care to make a statement this morning?

Mr. PETRI. Only to underscore the importance of this hearing and subject, and to say that it is probably unfortunately the truth that we have a major problem here. The major contribution in the area of solving the problem of adult illiteracy has been made not by the Department of Education but by the Department of Defense in bringing literacy to people who enlist in the armed forces and who do not have literacy at the time of their enlistment. And of course, that only reaches a small sector of the adult population, and we have to do better.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. We will proceed then with the hearing. First of all, may the Chair introduce and present the first witness, Congressman Jim Cooper from the 4th District of Tennessee.

Congressman, we welcome you before the committee. Your prepared statement in its entirety will be entered into the record, and we look forward to your testimony. I understand that you will deal with the highlights of it, and leave room for any questioning that we may have.

I have had an opportunity to read the statement in its entirety, and I certainly want to commend you on the manner in which you have presented the facts in your statement. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JIM COOPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. COOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your interest in this important subject, and an interest that was strong even before the subject became so fashionable. You have been a leader in this area for many years.

I would also like to thank a key staff member of mine, Julie Strong, who has immersed herself in these issues over the last year or so, becoming a tutor of illiterates herself. And she herself has provided great leadership for the State of Tennessee on these issues.

I represent the 4th District of Tennessee which ranks according to the 1980 census as the 427th most illiterate congressional district in the United States. Most of the adults in my district require adult education, to have a chance to shift from the minimum wage jobs that they have been accustomed in the past and jobs which we all know are rapidly leaving this country.

Last year I organized a legislative task force with myself and four state legislators. That task force has been completed and presented to the Governor of Tennessee and to the Commissioner of Education.

It contains numerous state level reform proposals. And already the state has agreed to triple the state contribution to literacy programming besides a very tight state budget, and we look forward to that contribution increasing to a level ten or twelve times above what the state had been contributing in the past.

In my opinion regarding federal legislation, the most important issue is whom the Adult Education Act should serve. I feel that the discussion of targeting is the most relevant topic that we could pursue. Especially since as we are all aware that adjusted for inflation that the AE Act funding has declined by about 38 percent since the Reagan Administration took office.

In Tennessee with about one million Tennesseans who need some literacy training, the $2 million federal grant amounts to about $2 for every potential student. Tennessee has chosen to spend that money in a way that about 25,000 people are reached every year, which sounds very good, but these people are only reached four hours a week for seven months a year.

I am worried about a part-time half year program like this, especially since 79 percent of the people enrolled in the program drop out during the summer. We do not have good enough records to know if they ever return or not.

It is my feeling that a full-time program would be very helpful, since two-thirds of the illiterates in Tennessee at least are unemployed and have plenty of time to engage in more comprehensive literacy training.

As we are all aware, I think, current programs have tended to skim the cream off the top of the illiterate population to educate those who were easiest and the cheapest to educate. And therefore, I feel that we need a separately authorized and separately funded title which would unlike current formula grants directly fund grant proposals coming from communities.

I would propose three guidelines for these grant proposals. I would ask that they be put forward by more than one government or private agency, so that we could have positive evidence of cooperation right from the very start, a problem which in Tennessee has been terrible to overcome, but I think that we have made progress in that area.

The second guideline would be to make a bold effort to reach the least educated and most in need. I define least educated as those who read at or below the fifth grade level. And those most in need, you would could arrange some sort of formula based on poverty or unemployment criteria.

The third and final guideline would be to have this a limited authorization, perhaps three years, and include money for assessment, so that at the end of the three year period that we would know whether the program was working or not, or at least have a preliminary indication.

My estimate which is not included in my written testimony would be a dollar figure on the order of $30 million would be appropriate for an effort like this. The cost per participant would be high.

We would probably need, as you have suggested in legislation of yours, an even start program to deal with child care problems, and we might need some transportation assistance to reach the hard core illiterate. But I feel that this would help fill the gap that was created when we left the old CETA program.

Again the JTPA program is only reaching one-quarter of the JTPA folks or high school dropouts, when two-thirds or three-quarters of those who are disadvantaged are high school dropouts.

Finally, I would like to mention two or three small ideas that I feel might have some potential at least in the long range, things that Congress should be exploring.

First, for those probably few people who are not economically disadvantaged but who are high school dropouts and need literacy training, perhaps charge those who have some limited resources a very small tuition fee.

That is being tried now by some private groups. And I think that on a limited basis that this might allow us to stretch federal dollars a little bit farther.

I have personally been very interested in data on the number of oral driver's licenses given. The Tennessee data is unavailable, but I understand from a study conducted in North Carolina that 165,000 oral driver's licenses are granted in that state every year. And in nineteen states with a driver's license, you can drive a tractor-trailer rig. So I think that there are numerous literacy related issues that could be explored there.

Finally, it seems to me possible that beginning readers do not have to be taught on a one on one basis. Small classes and small groups might be a more efficient way to teach these beginning readers.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, again I would like to thank you for your sustained interest in this important topic. Latecomers to the issue like myself are very grateful to you for having carried the torch for such a long time.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Jim Cooper follows:]

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear today to comment on reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. I would like simply to explain briefly my interest in this issue, and to make some suggestions for reauthorization based on my experience with how the Act has functioned in Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the Fourth District of Tennessee. Over half of all the adults in my district dropped out of school before the twelfth grade; in one county, more than 70% of the adults lack a high school education. This means the Fourth District ranks in the top ten most educationally disadvantaged Congressional Districts nationwide, along with such areas as the South Bronx.

The people of the Fourth District are hard-working, independent, proud individuals. In the past, they never needed a high school diploma to work on the family farm, or to get a job at a coal mine or a textile plant. But their traditional livelihoods are disappearing. According to the Department of Labor, 90% of the new jobs created from now through 1995 will be in service industries, compared to only 8% in manufacturing. DoL predicts that the level of literacy needed for the average job will rise correspondingly.

For many of the people I represent, adult education is their only hope for adapting to these recent changes in our economy. Many of them do not have the basic reading and writing skills needed to be accepted for or benefit from job and vocational training.

Last year I organized a Legislative Task Force on Literacy in Tennessee. I and four state legislators held a statewide conference and two subsequent hearings to investigate the problem of illiteracy and to make recommendations on adult education to the newly elected Governor.

In January of this year, my Task Force issued a report, Tennessee Literacy 2000, which concluded that at least half a million Tennesseans lack the basic skills needed for most jobs and that this number appears to have held steady over the last decade. The Task Force recommended that Tennessee launch a comprehensive literacy initiative involving volunteers as tutors and teachers' aides in every county, professional adult educators teaching full-time in every county, and mobile training and resource teams. The Task Force also asked the Governor to create a Literacy 2000 Commission. This Commission would develop a long-range plan for meeting adult education needs in the state and would coordinate implementation of this plan.

I'm happy to report that Tennessee has recently moved to triple funding for adult literacy programs in response to the Task Force recommendations. In addition, a coalition of state agencies and community groups recently won a $100,000 Gannett Foundation grant to improve coordination and planning of adult literacy efforts in the state.

My work on this issue in Tennessee has convinced me that the single most important issue for Congress to resolve during reauthorization is the question of who the Adult Education Act should serve. The U.S. Department of Education's last comprehensive assessment of the Adult Education Act, published in 1980, reached the same conclusion: "From a national perspective ... what appears to be needed in the decade of the 1980's is emphasis on more clearly targeting the federal program and on helping local projects serve the targeted population groups."

Let me illustrate this point with an example from my own state. Tennessee's Department of Education estimates that about one million Tennesseans could potentially be enrolled in ABE programs. The federal Adult Education grant to the state in FY 1985 was about $2 million, or about two dollars for every potential student. This grant, along with the state match, enabled ABE and GED programs to teach a total of 25,000 people, four hours a week, for seven months of the year.

Is this part-time, half-year program the best way for adults to learn? Well, the 1980 national assessment of ABE found that students who remained in the program for at least a year benefitted most. That study also found that 79% of those students enrolled in the spring don't come back the following fall. This would seem to argue that a year-round program might be more effective.

As for holding classes just two to four hours a week, it is interesting to note that two-thirds of the 25,000 ABE students in Tennessee last year were unemployed. Had classes been available, many of these people could have been attending school full-time and moving through the program and on to jobs or job training much more quickly.

But Tennessee, like most states, had some tough choices to make. The state had a small amount of federal money to serve a large and vaguely defined target population. The state chose to make a limited number of classes available in every county rather than fund full-time, year-round programs in only a handful of counties.

Nationwide the Adult Education Act has been chronically underfunded given the size of its target population. The U.S. Department of Education's 1980 study said that only 4% of the target population was being served. And since 1980, federal funding for adult education has remained essentially frozen, which really means that when adjusted for inflation, funding has declined by about 38%.

The 1980 U.S. Department of Education assessment concluded that Adult Education Act programs as a whole do tend to "cream" and that "the least literate and most alienated tend to be excluded." But this study rightly pointed out that there is little incentive for ABE programs to recruit when their resources are stretched to the limit simply teaching those who already seek out their services. It is no wonder that those 4% served have generally not been the "least educated and most in need." I see no reason for this to change unless Congress gives the Adult Education Act a clearer, more carefully focused mandate, and appropriates enough money for states to fulfill it.

As a first step toward making the Act more effective, I would like to see a separately authorized, separately funded title to the Act whose purpose is promoting economic independence for educationally disadvantaged adults. Unlike the formula grants to states, this new title would directly fund grant proposals from communities, taking into account the following criteria:

1) Only proposals submitted by more than one governmental agency or private organization, and involving coordination and cooperation among agencies and community organizations would be funded. The Gannett Challenge grant competition could be used as a model in developing this criteria.

2) Proposals must describe how the recipient plans to reach the "least educated," which I would define as those reading below the 5th grade level, without regard to the number of years of school completed. I would ask the U.S. Department of Education to develop guidelines for defining the "most in need" based on a combination of poverty and unemployment criteria. These guidelines would need to allow for local flexibility in defining the "most in need" because it may differ greatly from community to community -- for example, in urban areas it is more likely to be the unemployed but in rural areas it is more often the working poor.

3) This title would have a limited authorization, perhaps three years, and would include money for an assessment of the projects funded by it. At the end of this time, we could judge the title's success or failure, and decide whether to expand or eliminate it.

The cost per participant would probably be high. These programs would probably have to provide more supportive services like child care and transportation than most ABE programs do. But if we are serious about giving the millions of illiterate or functionally illiterate Americans a second chance, we need to remove the barriers that have kept the Adult Education Act from reaching them in the past.

I believe this type of grants program would reach people not being helped by any other federal education or training program. It would help fill the gap left when we switched from CETA to the Job Training Partnership Act which serves many fewer undereducated individuals than CETA did. Only about one-quarter of the people JTPA accepts into its programs are high school dropouts, despite the fact that nearly two-thirds of the disadvantaged, JTPA's target population, didn't complete high school. I think we should also ask the Department of Labor to look at establishing a learning gains performance standard to encourage JTPA programs to serve more undereducated adults under Title II-A.

I have a number of other suggestions concerning adult education which I'd like to see explored further. One idea is to ask those ABE students who are not economically disadvantaged to pay a small tuition fee so that more of the federal funds can go toward providing services for those who cannot afford to pay. Many private, non-profit adult education programs already do this. I don't think that it is unreasonable for Congress to admit that we cannot afford to offer a free education to any adult over 16 without a high school diploma, regardless of their income.

Another idea concerns the fact that all fifty states currently allow people who cannot read the driver's license exam to take it orally. I think there is great potential for working with the National Highway Traffic Saftey Administration to collect national data on the number of oral driver's exams taken each year, and for developing a guide for local Motor Vehicle Departments to use to refer oral test takers to local literacy programs.

A third suggestion is that the Department of Education encourage literacy programs, both private and ABE-sponsored, to break through the dogma that says beginning readers have to be taught one-on-one. Under the Right to Read program, for example, beginning readers were taught in groups as large as thirty or forty students. This approach can be feasible if volunteers are asked to help as teacher's aides, and not just as one-on-one tutors.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I have come to appreciate in the past year the tremendous dedication of those who have worked in adult basic education and literacy for years. I feel that we owe them a debt of gratitude for doing the best they can with meager resources, an overwhelming job, and a public that by and large has not known or cared about them.

I would also like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for focusing attention on the issue of illiteracy in hearings over the last two years. I believe support is growing in Congress for adult education, and I am also encouraged by the Administration's willingness to request additional money for these programs. I look forward to working with you on this issue.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, thank you, Mr. Cooper. You obviously are not a late comer. The fact that you have worked at the state level I think is commendable. And certainly in the reauthorization of this program, we will lean very heavily on the expertise that you have and the experience that you have gone through.

I must confess, however, that your wonderful suggestions are not likely to find very much acceptance unfortunately, and I think that is the irony of this situation. That we recognize the problem and we talk about it, but then do very little about it. And even now, the recommendations of this committee are being subjected to the scrutiny of the Budget Committee.

And whether or not we can really take the recommendations that you have made and incorporate them into the recommendations of this committee will obviously be of great concern to us. Because it would seem that the more that we recommend that the less that we are going to get from the Finance Committees.

May I ask you this. Your state through your Governor certainly has been one of the exceptions to the number of efforts that have been put forth by other Governors by most of the states. You seem to be somewhat out in front as it were.

Do you believe that the present tendency of the federal government itself through the Department of Education to shift the responsibility back to the states and to expect them to undertake more vigorous efforts as the federal government retrenches is a sound and expedient way of dealing with this problem?

Mr. COOPER. I do not. Much of the credit for the Tennessee development should go to our new Governor, who partisanship aside happens to be a Democrat who is very concerned about poor rural Tennesseans. Tennessee is the exception to the rule. We are finally taking on more responsibility, but I wish that the Department of Education had nudged, forced, encouraged, whatever it took to get us to do this years ago.

I look forward to strong leadership at the federal level, leadership which to be honest I think is lacking from the Department of Education today.

Chairman HAWKINS. As you said in your statement, there has been a great reduction in constant dollars in the federal program feeble from its beginning. And for that reason, we have indicated that in the report which I referred to earlier that the reference to other programs that may be available at the federal level is just not actually in existence.

We are looking to this specific Adult Literacy Act as the vehicle for making the changes that we propose. In that connection, we certainly will be calling on you to assist us. Mr. Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps it is due to the Tennessee example and efforts such as those spoken of today that they are finally seeing the light over in the Office of Management and Budget, and the President's team has requested a 25 percent increase in funding for adult education in its submission to this Congress.

As we castigate them in some areas, we ought to recognize that they are at least doing something helpful, that instead of level funding they are going from about $104 to $130 million in their re-

quest. Now it will be up to us to convince our colleagues to hold the line or improve on that recommendation.

I am curious just to see if there are any comments that you would like to make on the question of trying to beef up or work through existing efforts to help the same population that we are trying to help with the adult literacy efforts rather than having a duplicative delivery system put in place, or if that would or would not be a problem with this Act.

We have, of course, the Job Training Partnership Act and the Vocational Education programs attempting to give job skills and employment to people. And as part of that effort, adult literacy certainly would make a lot of sense.

Should we be trying to build on those sorts of programs, or should we be going ahead and be giving grants to people who are just going to be worrying about adult literacy and leave to others and to duplicate funding the problems addressed by the Job Training Partnership Act, the vocational system, state and local school district programs, and in English education programs for foreign students for the variety of people that they are directed at? Or should we try to integrate and concentrate what limited resources that we have to get a bigger result?

Mr. COOPER. I am certainly not against trying to improve any government program. But in my limited Tennessee experience, it is going to be virtually impossible to make JTPA or any of these other programs that will really reach the hard core illiterate.

To me, you need a specialized effort, because for a variety of reasons other programs just are not reaching these people. Therefore, I would urge in this case a separate type of program to reach the hard core illiterate, because right now they are being almost completely ignored, and they are becoming something of a under class.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Williams, in your absence, I did commend you on taking the initiative in the area of adult education in drafting legislation. I hated to have you not be present at that time to receive the commendation, so I am giving it to you post haste.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I was only late, Mr. Chairman, because I was kind of fishing for you to do it twice.

Chairman HAWKINS. It is in the record. You may read it. Everyone heard it except you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, you are very kind and generous as always, and I appreciate you and appreciate your kinds words about me. The real leader on this effort, specifically the illiteracy portion of it is Congressman Cooper, who has done not only good work but a good amount of work, as you can tell from his testimony and in answers to the questions.

And I simply want to join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming Jim and accepting his testimony, and giving him my own personal thanks for his leadership in the illiteracy portion of our concern about adult education.

Mr. COOPER. Thank you. I appreciate that. Mr. Chairman, if I could just add one note to your study.

Chairman HAWKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. I have not seen your study yet. But in my experience in Tennessee, despite federal government claims that there are 79 programs operating in the literacy area and some vast

amount of federal money being spent on literacy, in practice in Tennessee if it were not for the AEA there would not be a literacy effort.

The amounts spent if they are spent by these 78 other programs are so small, or so negligible, or so unorganized that they almost might as well not exist. So I appreciate your efforts on the AEA and more power to you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, and thanks for your appearance before this committee. Before proceeding, the Chair would like to make one brief announcement.

Last Tuesday in the hearings before this committee, Ms. Carol Whitten, who heads the bilingual program for the Department of Education, was a witness. And at the time, in the exchange of comments between Ms. Whitten and the Chair, I indicated that the Department had not responded to a letter which I had written a month earlier asking some specific questions.

At the conclusion of the hearing, in checking with my staff, I discovered that the Department had made a reply and had responded to my letter the Friday before the hearing. Unfortunately, the staff had not informed the Chair of the receipt of that material.

So I would like to express my apology to the Department in terms of that specific communication, and to indicate in the record that they had responded. And we will add my statement indicating receipt of that material at the time that I had unfortunately criticized them for not having answered.

At this point, I would like to ask the witnesses to assemble at the witness table. It is a panel consisting of Mr. Mitch Snyder; Dr. Fay Bryant from the Assault on Illiteracy Program from New York City; and Mr. Garrett Murphy, Director of the Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs for the New York State Education Department. If those individuals who have been listed as witnesses this morning kindly assemble at the witness table.

We will proceed first of all with Mr. Mitch Snyder. Mr. Snyder, I have never met you. This is the first time that I have even seen you. But I seem as if I know you, because I have heard so much about you, and also have seen you on TV frequently. And it is a pleasure to welcome you this morning as a witness before this committee. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MITCH SNYDER, CENTER FOR CREATIVE NONVIOLENCE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. SNYDER. I apologize for the absence of any written testimony, but we have neither typewriters nor Xerox machines out on the heat grate. So I am unable to provide you with written testimony.

Not too long ago, Chairman Gray and other members of the Budget Committee including Mr. Williams visited the shelter that we operate just a few blocks from here. And in the course of walking through that shelter and talking, we had a brief discussion about illiteracy in the shelter and illiteracy among the homeless. And it was out of that discussion or as a result of that discussion I believe that it was suggested that I come here this morning.

I suppose that I should say first that I consider it as unconscionable and as unacceptable that we have tens of millions of Ameri-

cans who are functionally illiterate as I do that we have millions of Americans who are living out on our streets like untouchables.

We are the wealthiest country that the earth has ever seen. We have the resources at our disposal to freeze dry life, to send people back and forth to the moon, to do all kinds of technological wizardry, and yet we have not reached the point where we are prepared or willing to guarantee our citizens what they require in order to live like human beings.

And I think that is an absolute sin. And I think that there is a just and loving God, and that God looks down with increasing disfavor on your great arrogance and the misuse of our wealth and resources.

More specifically, there are among homeless people as one would assume a large number of illiterates. For many of those people, the ability to read and write would provide a passport out of the shelters and off the streets, and nothing more would be required.

Simply because for those who are illiterate the kinds of jobs that are available in this city and in any other area that I ever visited pay such low wages that even though many work and work very hard, and some who work two jobs, they simply do not have enough money to be able to afford a place to live.

So while the Administration has consistently reduced the amount of money available to begin to reach out more aggressively to those who are illiterate, in spite of that I would suggest that resources that are available or at least some portion of them be directed towards that group of people for whom it would make a tremendous amount of immediate difference.

Their lives would change more radically than probably anybody else's if they were able to compete in the open market, because they were able to read and write at a level that would allow them to rise above the kind of minimum wage jobs that are available to them, exclusively available to them.

So I would strongly encourage you to keep fighting for resources and for funds to begin to roll back the absurd number that we are faced with in our country who are illiterate, and to more specifically begin to reach out if it has not already occurred to that portion of the population which is most desperate and most destitute, and for whom literacy training and opportunities would and could make a tremendous amount of difference.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, thank you, Mr. Snyder. We will hear from the other witnesses, and then I am sure there will be some questions of you.

Dr. Fay Bryant from the Assault on Illiteracy Program. Dr. Bryant, we welcome you before the committee.

STATEMENT OF JANET JONES BALLARD, ASSAULT ON ILLITERACY PROGRAM

Ms. BALLARD. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Hawkins, members of committee, and other distinguished members of the House, I am Janet Jones Ballard, and I am international president of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, and Fay Bryant's immediate successor. And Ms. Bryant is now president of the Assault on Illiteracy Program. But because of job commitments, she could not be here today.

Chairman HAWKINS. We are glad to welcome you in her place. I did not know Dr. Bryant. I just assumed that you were responding to the introduction. And for that, I apologize.

Ms. BALLARD. That is quite all right. Thank you for allowing me to be here, and to tell you a little bit about the Assault on Illiteracy Program, and we use the acronym AILP. This is a coalition of ninety predominantly black organizations who are recognizing that even though each of us has some kind of program in education, that by coalescing that we might be somewhat more effective in our efforts.

The AILP was formed about seven years ago. And since that time through the local chapters of the member organizations, we have taken programs to help eradicate illiteracy in our communities, particularly among blacks.

Today we are really interested in introducing to you another part of what we consider an essential piece of eradicating illiteracy, and that is using the community as the base for this. Now our intent is not to duplicate the formal efforts of educational institutions or other programs, but our intent is to complement and supplement these efforts.

We are using as a model in some of the things that we do Great Street School in Los Angeles in the Watts area. And a black woman went into this school as principal, and you can well imagine what the illiteracy rate was and the level in that school.

And within a six year period using techniques that she developed using the community, she was able to raise the level of 1100 minus 40 students. And what she did was to go into the community and involve parents and to help the community become aware of their ownership in the problem of illiteracy, and therefore convince the community that they had some responsibility in helping to eradicate it.

And essentially that is the theory of AILP. And so we have taken these programs into the communities. Now what we are interested in our coming before you is asking that we be a part of helping to include this particular piece, the community involvement, the approach of the volunteer in the effort.

Most of our leadership in our organizations are professional people and many are professionals in formal education, but many are not. The organizations included are health organizations, social work organizations, and all of the other areas related to human resources.

So we feel that our own individual background as leaders of the organization and the programs that our local member organizations and chapters have are essential to helping to develop a plan for the eradication of illiteracy that goes beyond the formalized structure.

And we are recommending that this particular component be included in this program, in the bill, the matter of the community base and the volunteer effort which is so vitally needed. Because we recognize that it is going to take all of us working with this.

And because we are predominantly black, we have a special concern for the extent of illiteracy in the black community and feel that we have some special skills and expertise in helping to address this and to deal with this.

[Prepared statement of Janet Jones Ballard follows:]

78-416 O - 88 - 2

March 19, 1981

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
For
House Committee On Education And Labor

First, we in the Assault On Illiteracy Program (AOIP) must commend our Congress on recognizing--and doing every thing conceivable in its power about--the priority need for compensatory assistance to a large segment of our population which has been categorized as "educationally deprived", and who suffer from a lack of a "can do" attitude, and who live in surroundings which tend not to add to their needed self esteem.

Second, we would like to tell you about why our Black community-building leadership had to become involved. Our most successful "inner-city" educators inform us that--due to the myriad awesome and depressing predicaments in our inner cities--no teacher or school administrator can be successful among many therein without total, long-term **interorganizational commitment and involvement from the preponderance of all the community-building organizations in the school area to help in a coordinated way to transform** those communities in every possible positive way.

However, we learned quite painfully that many local organizations absolutely could not be enlisted to work "interorganizationally" on a long-term and coordinated basis with any other groups simply because these "others" were viewed as competitors by their governing national bodies.

Thus, teachers should not be held responsible--as they seem now to be--for the aftermaths of poor housing, for job discrimination, for the moral climate, for the tenuous state of family life so prevalent in the inner cities and for the general lack of positive role models within--and good pride-filled images of--our communities. That responsibility resides primarily with the the people in the communities.

It is for that reason that the conceivers of--and determined movers behind--the Assault On Illiteracy Program (AOIP) simultaneously did two essential things as follows:

> 1. We went directly to the governing bodies of all of our national Black-led organizations to do what many considered previously as "absolutely impossible"...ie, we appealed to them about changing their policies so as to allow--and encourage--their local chapters/affiliates to work together for the positive "affective-oriented" needs of our inner cities.
>
> After a relentless struggle--and with God's help--we now have a literacy-enhancement coalition of well over 90 national Black-led organizations, as well as hundreds more of regional and localized community-uplifting organizations working together under the banner of AOIP. And,
>
> 2. We developed a proven-to-be successful mechanism which not only serves as a compensatory ego-strengthening and comprehension-enhancement tool to both supplement and complement the wonderful work of our hard-working classroom teachers...But also fulfills a similar role with parents who desperately need to develop reading skills, as well as serves as an essential interorganizational communications bridge among our precious volunteers.

We emphasize that we are an all-volunteer network that serves solely to make easier and make optimally effective the wonderful work of the classroom teachers and administrators who--without such complementary and supplementary help outside their jurisdictional lines--never could become successful with all the fine and vitally-needed help they are getting from Chapter I and other efforts in our inner cities.

We hope, too, that all of you here can recognize that this amazing of AOIP must have been providential and timely because for anysingle community to attempt such would find such a vital entity impossible to replicate.

Our full written testimony is submitted herewith.

March 26, 1987

FINALIZED STATEMENT PREPARED FOR THE JOINT SUB-COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR--U.S. CONGRESS

The Honorable Augustus F. Hawkins, other distinguished members of the Committee On Education and Labor, and all other greatly-esteemed Members of Congress, we--the leaders of the more than 90 national Black-led organizations which are coalesced under the banner of the Assault On Illiteracy Program (AOIP)--are most pleased and honored to come before you in Washington, D.C. today.

Originally, on very short notice, we had requested time last month when over 300 of our leaders and resource volunteers were convening here in Washington, D.C. However, this date is just as appropriate for us to give testimony.

Our objective is to to share with our Congressional leadership some of our experiences which easily and rather quickly could enable our Chapter-I and other classrooms relating to inner-city needs to become optimally productive.

Essential for you to know in this regard is that what we are about to relate, deals largely with complementary and supplementary things that must be done within our largely-Black inner cities by those of us who live within--and must identify with--the urgent literacy-enhancement and/or community-building needs of these areas of educational deprivation.

Most important for all to be aware is the fact that the "root causes"--and the resultant needs, or resources--among the Black "functionally illiterate" population are vastly different than among those who can identify as White here in America.

Also, since the Governors of every state must understand--and work in tandem with--all of these facts and with your decisions, a copy of this testimony is being sent to each of them.

In order to save time--and for ease of understanding, we have divided this presentation into three brief parts as follows:

PART I: Background On Who We Are As "Community" Leaders And Why No Inner-City--Or Largely Black--Classroom Optimally Could Educate Properly Without Broad Based Community Involvement.

PART II: The "Success Model" Replicated--And Extended--By AOIP. And,

PART III: Recommendations For Providing The "Missing Link" In Inner-City Education.

PART I--WHO WE ARE: As helpful background, we are the only coalition of national Black-led "community-building" organizations from all disciplines and interests, importantly including highly-successful educators who dared to deviate from the traditional "norms" within inner cities. Among our present affiliation are well over 90 such "national" bodies, as well as hundreds more of regional and localized community-uplifting organizations.

Local and state officials of each of these national bodies are the leaders who have planning and implementing responsibilities for all we do.

WHY WE HAD TO BECOME INVOLVED: All educators know that there are two essential learning aspects. One is known as the "cognitive" (or tutorial) aspect. The other is known as the "affective"--ie, ego consideration or environmental--aspect. Educators have learned that students who do not feel good about themselves or their environments (ie, their communities) often have a lessened will or desire to learn.

With the wonderful and thoughtful assistance of Congress and otherwise, many excellent "cognitive" materials and approaches are available for easy group use. These are used every day

by almost all teachers. On the other hand, and for a variety of reasons, few teachers have the resources to deal with the "affective" aspect of learning in the case of "inner-city" (largely Black) students.

It is in the inner-city settings that the state of family life and community-induced predicaments are so awesome that no teacher can be successful without total commitment and involvement of the community-building organizations in the school area to help transform those communities in every possible positive way. By this, we mean transformation into such secure, productive, value-laden and hope-filled entities that everyone therein would be motivated to want to learn and become a responsible part.

Further, since the 47% rate of Black "functional illiteracy" in our inner city communities represent that illiteracy predicament "in extremis" in every community and state--and because it is we in the Black community who are suffering most from all the other resultant "ills", we felt compelled to develop that sorely needed complementary support mechanism to help our inner city teachers. At the same time, we knew that any degree of real success would have to be a joint and/or cooperative venture on a long-term basis...and with the help and encouragement of Congress.

Under ordinary circumstances, we were convinced that no single teacher or school could even begin to address effectively such an awesome challenge. Yet, perhaps not so surprisingly to those who know how relentless Congressman Hawkins is in his pursuit of excellence for our youth, we, in ADIP, found a model for our replication right in the heart of Watts in Los Angeles at a school named Grape Street.

PART II--THE MODEL: People tell us that "God works in mysterious ways". We found that to be the case when we in ADIP searched for a success model that we could replicate and extend where necessary. We knew that there were many many "inner city" educators who had done fantastic jobs on an individual and somewhat isolated basis. However, what we needed was a more extensive success model which many felt was not possible to find.

Nonetheless, successful inner-city educator after successful inner-city educator pointed out to us that the Grape Street experience was an excellent epitomization of their collective best. This was a case wherein a determined and undaunted principal took over a school in the heart of Watts which was second from the bottom among almost 600 schools in the LA Unified School District in terms of reading scores.

Yet, within a brief span of just six and one half (6 1/2) years, all 1100 of her students--except 40 special cases--were on actual grade level...a situation which never has taken place on such a broad level before...and unfortunately has not been replicated since.

However, we were determined to find out 1) all the reasons why this unusual model had not been replicated 2) what we as leaders of our inner city communities could do to rectify the situation in an ideal way and 3) what was needed from you here in Congress and others to make this model a real tribute to you as it serves the just and equitable educational needs of our inner cities.

OUR EXTENSIONS: We found we could base our extensions on a number of things as follows:

A. We found there were many administrators who were highly skilled in working with and delegating effectively and efficiently among teachers, students, parents and policy makers. Yet, there was one essential element that practically all educators felt they could not reach effectively in our inner city...and this was the community, which, in the case of inner cities, was considered almost an impossible task.

Despite this seeming "impossibility", that Grape Street principal did go out into the community and actually organize not only the parents...but also they organized the ministers, the business persons and the former gang members, who previously had marauded the school, forming "block associations" and "patrols" dedicated to the school. Moreover, this brilliant educator and administra-

tor "par excellence" involved everyone in the planning of all things for which they were responsible.

However, what this successful educator and others like her feel was their major key to success--and is still the major "missing link" for effective inner city education broadly is encouraging and enabling teachers to make every one of their children feel they were precious "Children of God" with all the power and potential of the Almighty within themselves. Carrie Haynes, former Grape Street School principal, has stated that "by developing such a 'can do' attitude within each student, children hunger for knowledge to such an extent that no teacher can deny them of learning.

Carrie Ayers Haynes' work at the Grape Street School was difficult. However, because this great lady--who was rescued time and time again with the timely help of Augustus Hawkins and other legislators--was sent providentially to AOIP, this magnificent model for success has remained alive.

B. We found that all students needed continuous ego strengthening ...and that there was no built-in mechanism for achieving this among inner cities' students in a manner that paralleled that which is institutionalized for students who can identify as White.

Thus, when Carrie Ayers Haynes took over a large part of the early planning within AOIP, she saw to it that almost every national organization was involved in--and committed to--its "community-building" needs. One of the first things she--along with others--addressed was the development of some ego-strengthening and comprehension-enhancement tools which would be produced on a continuing weekly basis for Chapter I-type students.

Quite importantly, this task was to be--and always has been--under the supervision of the highly-trained and long experienced educators in the National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. with the assistance of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. and the National Association of University Women. Also, all of this work is done from within--and by the respected leadership of--the Black community-building organizations without any fee for themselves whatsoever. (Samples of these highly-productive ego-strengthening materials--which are creatively designed to reach the previously-difficult-to-reach parents--are being made available here today.)

Also seen to was the fact that almost everything in AOIP is designed administratively, and in terms of focus, for both complementing and supplementing the massive and presently impossible task of our classroom teachers who have responsibility for that target group.

Also important for all Members of Congress to know is that success for our approach is due, in great measure, to the fact that a very large part of our focus is on removing the uniquely imposed "root causes" of illiteracy among many Black Americans ...ie, overcoming the image of self and of community which is so negative (or low) that an inordinate--and growing--number of these precious children of God do not feel good enough about themselves to want to learn and lead responsible and value-laden lives.

C. We found that much of our failings were due to the Black community's own lack of insightfulness in terms of the degree of emphasis. Our feelings are mixed as we prepared this statement to be presented to this body of most honorable legislators. On the one hand, we are saddened that we must come to you, as we approach the twenty first century, with an appeal for race-related justice in terms of focus within what all of us must agree is an unusually-fine educational system nationally. No one can deny that we have excellent "cognitive-related" approaches for those motivated to want to learn.

Yet, even though such approaches are not readily available for those forced to identify with the Black community, we are indeed extremely proud that we are in a relatively young and rapidly progressing nation wherein our minds are flexible and we are willing to learn from our mistakes of the past...Thus, we now

...that there was a major "affective related" mistake made by many of us in Black America and elsewhere during our "civil rights" struggle...and subsequently.

That tremendous and grave educationally related error was our not properly assessing--and dealing in a proper remedial way with--the largely-overlooked ego strengthening needs of Black Americans. In short, many of us were so heavily focused on "integrating" our schools that--in the process of this "understandable" step, our educational systems, in general, failed to develop--and put into their curriculum and other supportive programs--the mechanisms for building esteem, pride and a "can do" attitude that paralleled those institutionalized mechanisms already in place for learners who could identify as White.

Further, it is in this area, alone, that AOIP has its unique value that neither Congress nor others can easily replicate.

Additionally, these mechanisms and tools developed by the widest possible array of the best Black professionals on behalf of AOIP are not focused on "integrating" our classrooms or communities. We are not opposed to such on any grounds. But, our emphasis is on helping our largely-Black inner city schools to enable our young to be realistic about who they are as people who--as have many others--will face discrimination...and who must learn to be prepared for such in a constructive way.

Presently, when students are not so prepared--and falsely and unrealistically are not made to understand that they are a discrete population group which may always (in our lifetimes) have to identify as Black--the "balloon of unreality" often bursts in the real world contacts. Then, drug addiction, teen pregnancy and other types of amoral behaviour often result.

AOIP is focused heavily on Blacks building their own presently-downtroden communities into mutually-supportive "oases of hope".

Neither Congress nor any other legislative body could mandate that our Black community--or any other community of outstanding citizens--be required to organize and volunteer their services in both complementary and supplementary ways for the needs of our schools.

Yet, through AOIP, we now have in place not only that volunteer mechanism to work as a body with the schools...But also, the development of materials which--when properly utilized in each of our communities--will parallel those ego strengthening mechanisms that are institutionalized for those students who can readily identify as White in our American society. Important for you to know is that AOIP seeks no funds administratively or salary-wise for itself.

We, in AOIP, have volunteer groups already organized in hundreds of cities...and stand ready to do so in all cities with inner-city and/or Chapter-I-Type students who are "educationally deprived" minorities. What now is missing is the proper kind of encouragement from Congress to see that inner-city-type schools take advantage of this vitally needed assistance without which, there can be no real and lasting success.

Detailed background on AOIP's materials and methodology are available here for each committee member and for their staffs. Our concern, in the main, is that this Congress take advantage of the potential of this unprecedent coalition of Black Americans who are committed to address--on a volunteer basis--those "affective-oriented" literacy-enchancement needs which only can be addressed effectively by those who live within our inner cities.

PART III--RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS FOR PROVIDING THE "MISSING LINK" FOR EFFECTIVE INNER CITY EDUCATION:

Our recommendations are stated simply: Having the staff of this important sub-committee work out with AOIP the kind of easily-achievable and cost effective activities that need to be done to build in this complementary element which will help provide the "missing link". We are requesting similar action by each governor.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, thank you for a very excellent statement.

Our final witness is Mr. Garrett Murphy, Director of the Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs, New York State Education Department. Mr. Murphy, we welcome you before the committee.

STATEMENT OF GARRETT MURPHY, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS, NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins.

Honorable members of the subcommittee, I am Garrett W. Murphy, and I am Director of the Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs for the New York State Education Department, but I am offering this testimony on behalf of the Council of State Directors of Adult Education and the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education.

I have been in this literacy field now for twenty-five years spending fifteen of it running a store front center operated by the Albany Public Schools. I am now a bureaucrat, but my wife has jumped in to take my place in the field. And despite the fact that she is a mother of fifteen, she now teaches beginning readers and tells me at dinner what I used to know on my own.

This Act has stayed pretty much it has been for its entire twenty year history while other Acts such as Voc Ed or the Employment and Training System have changed quite a bit over that period. And essentially it is because it has been and is an excellent piece of legislation. It is responsive.

Its planning provisions allow states with will and leadership to meet local and regional needs without a lot of special set-asides or percentum stipulations. It uses the skill of all providers, and that is very important.

Schools, colleges, community based organizations, libraries, volunteers, we manage to use them all, because this one Act allows us to do that.

And over the last several years, there has been too much talk of the purported superiority of one delivery system over another, and this does not help the cause of illiteracy in the United States at all.

What we should be doing is cherishing and using every resource available. And in New York, we are trying to do that as best we can. We started in New York City, and the PLUS campaign has got us all working together throughout the state allowing every single agency who can get into this business and have a role to have a role and to be built into the system.

We hear sometimes that adults will not return to schools for their education, and we find that is not the case in New York certainly where over 80 percent of our adult basic education students are going to school based programs and this includes the very basic readers. Four out of five even basic readers despite the magnificent job that the volunteers are doing in this area, four out of five are still being educated by the schools.

The Act's planning mechanism allows each state to adjust its program for urban models, rural models, programs for homeless, and we have had some all the way through to programs to help the

competitiveness of America's work place. You can do it all in the one Act.

I have some specific recommendations. The 20 percent limitation for institutionized I believe should be retained. No one sector should access a disproportionate amount of the Act.

On the 20 percent for secondary programming, we recommend that it be retained as it is. We do not wish to expand monies any percent for secondary education. We believe, as Congressman Cooper pointed out, that the great preponderance of the monies ought to go for the least educated and most in need.

We also believe that these adults should have access to a full range of opportunity, which means not only to be able to go just so far and stop, but be able to move through a high school education as well.

In dealing with the maintenance of effort, if there is to be a maintenance of effort in the Reauthorized Act, we recommend that the 90 percent formula of maintenance of effort which presently applies to the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act also applies to the Adult Education Act rather than a full 100 percent maintenance of effort.

The new Section 309 which appropriates money for research development, and demonstration and dissemination, we strongly support. But we advise that a committee be formed to advise the federal government on the administration of these monies, and that that committee include members of the State Council and members of AAACE.

Literacy, as we know, has assumed increased importance or an awareness of its increased importance, because it has always been important, but we just have not realized how much it undergirded so many other things.

And now we see the statistics that the people with the lowest education have the least income, are more likely to be incarcerated, or are more likely to be on public assistance. And we see especially in the new Learning To Be Literate in America publication the fact that children's levels of education is linked irrevocably with that of their parents. And if their parents have not gotten a sufficient education, the odds are those children will not make it either.

We see that public assistance programs in this country will require a first step of literacy if they are ever to move people from dependence towards independence.

And we see in the work place and in my own state in Rochester, in the Rochester Products model that we have put together, where they took out the old forges and they brought in new Japanese foundries into that factory in Rochester Products.

And what they said was, okay, all you people who used to carry a wrench this long around and do everything with manipulations now are going to have to run those foundries sitting at a keyboard and doing calculations and data entry.

And we had to go in with a basic skills program for 800 of those workers, rent a closed Catholic School down the street, and begin making that work force competitive. And where we have gone in in other places and done that, instead of dislocation, we have found

the labor force expanding and that company remaining competitive internationally.

There is a rapid escalation in this country of non-English speaking populations, especially Hispanic. And the strain is especially severe in situations where the adults are illiterate in their own language as well as English. And clearly, we need to do more in that area.

Therefore, we are supporting a number of special initiatives. That of Mr. Goodling for his family literacy, because it is very important, although we are concerned about the declining level of support.

Because populations which have a power base when you have that kind of beachhead legislation where you put money in and then withdraw it, the locals and the state do replace it. If you have got a population that does not have a power base, as the money is withdrawn the services decline proportionately.

We strongly support the work place literacy amendment of Mr. Biaggi in H.R. 1342. And the English proficiency amendment proposed by Mr. Martinez. But we propose greater involvement at the state level, so that Governors and chief school officers will have the full array of resources at their hands.

In summary, the Act should be reauthorized and recognized for what it is, a highly important piece of legislation. It should be continued and strengthened for the reasons that I have said and one more, and that is the education of the nation's children.

For twenty-five years, we in education have set aside the hopes of under-educated adults preferring to making the major investment in our children. And in so doing, we may have condemned both. The one essential element in a climate suitable for learning is hope. Without an atmosphere of hope, no learning takes place.

We fool ourselves into believing that we could successfully educate children who come from situations which are so devoid of structure, aspiration or control, because the generation upon which they must rely for care no longer believes that things will get better or that help will arrive.

And until they believe, until we rebuild hope in those families and those communities, our most sophisticated strategies for the education of children will not succeed.

This Act strongly supported and adequately funded offers our best hope of reaching both generations. Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Garrett W. Murphy follows:]

Executive Summary

The Adult Education Act:

has stood the test of time because of its simplicity and flexibility

has planning provisions which allow each state to operate programs which react to the state's needs

can support a variety of instructional approaches in many settings under the auspices of both public and private agencies

funds programs which span a range from instruction to homeless to workplace literacy programs which enhance America's competitiveness.

Of the various delivery systems supported by funding from the Act such as:

- public schools
- colleges
- libraries
- community based organizations
- vocational agencies
- employment and training agencies
- volunteer groups

all have a place in the system. No one system is inherently superior - even at lowest skill levels.

The Act's simple student eligibility requirements make programs under the Act natural partners with employment and training programs, programs to reduce welfare dependency, and vocational education programs.

Recommendations concerning certain provisions of the Act:

Section 304(b) - 20% limitation on programs for institutionalized. Retain; no single constituency should access a disproportionate share of resources.

Section 306 - 20% limitation on adult secondary programming. Retain; need is still greatest for adult basic education and English-as-a-second language. Do not diminish or reduce 20% limit; adults should have access to secondary education when their elementary (basic) needs are met.

Section 306(a)(7) - expansion through new provider agencies. Where community agencies are not full partners in the delivery system, "expansion" should be through all eligible agencies.

Section 307(b)(1) - maintenance of effort. Pattern after ECIA Chapter 2 by allowing a 90% maintenance of effort on aggregate expenditure or per full time equivalent student.

Section 309(a)(1) - research and development. Form an advisory committee of scholars and practitioners including representatives of the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education and American Association of Adult and Continuing Education.

Section 310 - staff development and special projects. Retain; quality should not be sacrificed even in times when funds for direct services to participants are scarce.

The Act has assumed greater importance in the last three years because:

its role in promoting workplace literacy to enhance American competitiveness

the clear relationship between the education level of children and that of their parents

its role in providing instruction to those with limited proficiency in English

increasing evidence linking income to educational level

the need of public assistance recipients for literacy instruction as the first step toward independence.

The Act should be supplemented with new targeted sections each with its own appropriation for:

workplace literacy; therefore we support HR 1342 which would add a new Section 316 to the Act

family literacy; therefore we support the family literacy provisions in HR 50 although we are concerned that declining federal support will result in declining levels of service

instruction in English for persons with limited proficiency in English; therefore we support the intent of HR 579, but recommend greater involvement with the State Grant program of the Adult Education Act.

The Congress may also wish to consider a new section of the Act designed especially to serve public assistance clients.

Without a strong program of adult literacy and basic skills education, the older generation in many U.S. communities loses hope. This lack of hope has a negative effect upon the learning ability of their children. Programs for adults may have their greatest effect upon the succeeding generation.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, thank you.

At a hearing in Los Angeles a week ago, we were informed of the situation with respect to homelessness in the City of Los Angeles, which I think has perhaps the largest amount of homeless people almost of any area. And at that time, it was a surprise to me that the strong connection between the homeless and job programs was accentuated by a recent act of Los Angeles County.

In the change from the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to the Job Training Partnership Act, the County of Los Angeles and I think that this story applies today because we are now talking about welfare reform and what may happen if we proceed with some of the current proposals—the example was brought out that in the County of Los Angeles, the general relief population at the time of the beginning of the Job Training Partnership Act was informed of the benefits that this act would bring about.

And as a result of that, the County of Los Angeles dumped some 17,000 persons who were on general relief in the County of Los Angeles onto the Job Training Partnership Act, but before the act was actually in operation. And then for more than a month these persons who had been receiving aid under general relief, and by definition had assets of less than $50 per person, were without any particular assistance whatsoever.

And as a result of that, some 4000 or 5000 of the general relief clients were somehow lost in the general population. They do not know what happened to them. And the speculation was and some evidence was presented that many of these joined the homeless, which I think is pretty typical of what may happen as we begin to talk about so-called welfare reform.

Is it going to be a scheme for local people to become relieved of financial responsibility for persons who will end up without any help whatsoever, and without jobs and without the literacy training that many of these programs are supposed to be providing for them, but without adequate protection.

And so as a result of that, it was brought to my attention, at least and among Mr. Martinez and others at the hearing, of the direct connection between some of these programs and the homeless people.

I therefore think, Mr. Snyder, that what we fear may happen may happen, and that is that too often these schemes are merely the excuse for increasing the number of homeless rather than bringing relief to them.

And I was wondering whether or not the so-called proposals to reform welfare which are now before us, whether you also fear that perhaps we will not provide the child care, we will not provide the literacy, we will not provide the jobs at decent wages that some of these schemes are proposing, if we simply put through on a hasty basis these ideas without the adequate protection that they may provide; in other words, are we actually creating the homeless population rather than doing anything to alleviate it?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I think that finally Congress is beginning to explore more seriously the role of the federal government in responding to the needs of homeless people. But folks like myself all across the country I think wince every time that we hear the term welfare reform.

Because while many people using it are certainly well-intentioned, our experience has been that any modification in the program and any effort to change to a considerable degree the programs that provide the basic necessities and sustainers of life almost always are structured in such a way as to reduce the number of people who will benefit from them.

It is almost as though you see a tube of toothpaste and somebody is squeezing it, and squeezing it and squeezing it, and out of the top predictably comes the toothpaste. Well, many of the changes that we have seen and many of the approaches that we have seen at a federal, state and local level seem to have as their primary purpose squeezing people out of those programs, and making it difficult if not impossible for them to continue to receive benefits to which they are legitimately and desperately in need of.

So I have great concern about the hell bent for leather approach to welfare reform. Because given the past history, and given our experiences, and given what we have seen happening not just in Los Angeles but all over the country, we see a fairly conscious effort to squeeze people out of those programs, and then we see officials scratching their heads and wondering where all of those folks went.

And if you ask the shelter operators and the soup kitchen providers, they will tell you where they went. They fell through the cracks, disappeared beneath that vaunted safety net, and now they are down there living out of garbage pails and subsisting in back alleys.

And it is almost inconceivable to me that it could be any worse, because it is already worse than it has ever been. But I think that it is conceivable that it could get worse. And that under the euphemistic title of welfare reform that we could well see further cutbacks in the kinds of services that people need in order to keep their head minimally above water.

And then everyone will say that statistically we are doing a wonderful job, because the numbers are shrinking. But up here the numbers are shrinking, and down here where the rubber is hitting the road the numbers are going to be growing.

Chairman HAWKINS. I just thought that we should express that concern. Because as we hasten to put through some of these proposals, we may not build into them the adequate safeguards that we need. We talk rather glibly about all of the child care that is going to be made available and all of the decent jobs. And at the same time, we are not supporting an increase in the minimum wage which means that the jobs that they are talking about will be paying less than a survival wage rate and so forth. And to get the federal government out of protecting its individuals too hastily may not be the best thing that can be done. Let me hasten, however.

Mrs. Ballard, you have mentioned very much about community base organizations and voluntary efforts. And let me commend the association that you represent because I think that they have done an excellent job.

But would you also agree that despite all of the fine things that we can say about volunteer efforts that are being made by organizations and the community efforts that are being put forth that the

problem of illiteracy is too large now for the combined efforts of these individuals, and that the inclusion of these efforts in any proposal cannot be used as any excuse to retrench on the federal obligations and federal funds?

You would not be suggesting that we need less federal efforts funding on the basis that the people at the local level and the volunteers are going to do the job, and consequently we did not need to give them any support?

Ms. BALLARD. Not by any means, and that is why I used the words that we see our efforts are being complementary or supplementary to those efforts. And those efforts indeed need to be increased.

Our approach has been towards the whole person, and recognizing that people have to have a desire to become literate. So we feel that it is through efforts such as ours that people can develop the self-worth in order to have them ready for the other programs which certainly cannot be minimized in any way.

And so I am glad that you raise that, because I would not want my comments about our efforts to be misconstrued in any way as suggesting that the federal effort be diminished but rather increased. And our role would only be to complement and to supplement these efforts.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, thank you for that clarification. Mr. Grandy.

Mr. GRANDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Murphy, at the end of your statement, you say that the Act should be strongly supported and adequately funded.

Do you have an idea of what your definition of adequate funding is for this particular act? I assume that it is above the President's request.

Mr. MURPHY. It is above the President's request. And if you look at the other two major development programs, the Vocational Education Act, although that has been targeted for demise but I do not believe will happen, that is $800 million in that area. And if you look at the Job Training Partnership Act, then you realize that both of these are somewhat crippled without an adequate literacy funding. And I would see no problem in going to a $200 million level for the Adult Education Act.

Mr. GRANDY. Currently, Based on a Department of Education report, there are 79 programs in 14 federal agencies that constitute about $347 million in fiscal year 1985.

Do you see a need to coordinate and focus these programs more directly, are we a little over-programmed and perhaps under-focused?

Mr. MURPHY. In fact, I left out of my oral testimony the fact that in our state we do coordinate. We have a joint Adult Education Act and Voc Ed Act RFPs. We engrain our money in the Job Training Partnership Act. We get money from JTPA for illiteracy. There is potential for coordination.

But with respect to the availability of that money which is vested in other statutes being made available for literacy, in most cases if you go to somebody and say I am out of money, may I have some of yours, you do not get very far.

If you go and say I have got some money and you have some for similar things and perhaps we can parlay them into a powerful program, then you do get that coordination, but you need something to go in with.

And simply moving from your own limited funding system to the others does not work that well. And not much of that money, the money identified in the reports, has really been identified as going to literacy programs. These are things that could be used and could be coordinated, but I do not think that much is happening right now, sir.

Mr. GRANDY. Do you have any statistics as to what percentage of your illiterate population, and I assume what I am referring to now would be a conventional illiterate, is speaking another language, does not understand English?

Mr. MURPHY. Both my state and the nation are about the same, in the low 40 percent.

Mr. GRANDY. The 40 percent would be non-English speaking?

Mr. MURPHY. Non-English speaking.

Mr. GRANDY. Am I correct in assuming that they are classified as conventional illiterates?

Mr. MURPHY. In my state, they would not unless they were at the lowest level. We have a somewhat more precise breakdown than the federal reporting requirements have. So we have four levels of English as a second language beginning with people who are illiterate in their own language, and four levels of basic skills.

And we looked at our population and found that of the 150,000 that we are presently serving that 75,000 of them, that is half, either read below the sixth grade level and are in the hard to serve category or at the lowest two levels of English as a second language, which means that they are in as great need as the others.

So we have a way of defining even within the ESL population how many are truly in the illiteracy range and how many are literate but need to transfer to another language.

Mr. GRANDY. And I assume that you would not be an advocate of in any way reshaping and redefining the bilingual education statutes which we were studying earlier to compensate for adult bilingual problems?

Mr. MURPHY. No. I think that the Bilingual Education Act involvement in adults is primarily in the parent ed realm which is appropriate. But the job of identifying and educating those people who need English, those adults who need literacy in English as a second language, should remain in this Act.

Mr. GRANDY. Just so I understand, many of these people, of course, are parents, and are you saying that this program is designed to teach those parents, and then there is the parent program in the Bilingual Education Act that supplements that, do you need both of them?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. The parent program in the Bilingual Education Act does not deal primarily with teaching them English or the upgrading of their basic skills. It is primarily to help them support their children's education and get involved in their children's education, which is a different kind of program. So the two can complement each other.

Mr. GRANDY. Finally, let me ask you, and maybe you do not have the statistic, but what percentage of your monies go towards finding and location of these people, and encouraging them to participate in a program? I would think that the needs would be quite a bit different between your state and mine which is very rural, and it is harder to find an illiterate base in Spencer, Iowa perhaps than it is New York City.

Mr. MURPHY. To go along with the PLUS campaign, Project Literacy U.S., we have inaugurated in New York State a New York You Can Read campaign, which is organized of regional consortia of agencies of all kinds. As I mentioned before, everybody working together.

And then we are sending out trainers to each one of those consortia to teach them how to reach out better and really go after the least educated and the most in need. And in the City of New York, 25 percent of the funds have to go to those who are at the zero to fourth grade level in their native langauge in addition to what we get in the English as a second language.

We have always made a very strong stand to reach out and to go after that population. The New York You Can Read campaign is presently funded at about $100,000, and that is the spur. It would be difficult to identify then how much each local agency is devoting to outreach in coordination with that.

Mr. GRANDY. Then I would ask you, and anybody on the panel may respond, do you have any thoughts about how you might reach out to an illiterate population in a rural community in which English is their first and only language? When you are in a dislocated worker situation like a lot of farmers are and may not have even the literacy skills to become competitive.

You are dealing with somebody who has been the head of a household for a long time and who will be thrown roughly into the work place probably with his wife and children. It is very hard to get him to come forward.

How do you use your funds in that area?

Mr. MURPHY. New York interestingly enough has the fourth largest rural population.

Mr. GRANDY. I am aware of that. That is why I wanted your opinion.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. We do use volunteers in those areas, and we have to go out and work with the families. We have set up programs at the work sites for dislocated workers. For those at the higher levels, we are using a correspondence program called GRASP, Giving Rural Adults a Study Program, and it is working very well. But you have to be like fourth grade up to be able to do that. So we still need, you know, human in place contact for the others.

Mr. GRANDY. As a rule of thumb, are you finding that most of your rural participants are fourth grade or above, and they are not totally functionally illiterate; you are talking about conventional illiterates, are you not?

Mr. MURPHY. We are finding the same range that we find in the rest of the state, which is about half of them above sixth grade and about half of them below. And we also have our intermediate units

called BOCES in New York State, which are especially within the rural parts of the state, and to set up programs there.

And they work with the local clubs, with the local businesses, with the farms, or with any kind of organization that we can. Generally, the best outreach is to find out where people go for help who may not know that they need literacy. They just know that they need help. And to connect in with that organization, get a class, or a teacher or a volunteer segment attached to that.

Mr. GRANDY. To your knowledge, does the Extension Service in the State of New York provide any assistance here through outreach?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, they do. The Cooperative Extension, I met with them last night. The Cooperative Extension has been working with us very regularly by way of outreach and identification. And in coordinating some instructional programs, some of the consumer homemaking type of skills that they can deliver along with our literacy skills.

Mr. GRANDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Grandy, may the Chair again remind you, I do not think that you were present, when we indicated that we had done a check on the assertion that there were 79 literacy programs being administered by federal agencies and they were expending in fiscal year 1985 some $347.6 million.

The study which we have and I will give you a copy of it indicated that they were identified as being literacy related, which meant that some authority existed for these agencies to become involved in literacy training, but that it was not necessarily required nor did we find that they were actually doing it.

The $347.6 million merely indicated a potential provided that these agencies did in fact engage in literacy training. What we were able to identify was that only $126.5 million was actually being expended, and that is only 36 percent of that amount.

So this throwing around some 79 agencies as somehow being involved in literacy training is not only a misrepresentation, but it is downright false.

Mr. GRANDY. Well, if the Chairman would yield, and I thank him for his clarification there.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thanks for the support. We are trying to get a better adjective, however, but yes.

Mr. GRANDY. These programs inclusive in the 79 figure, are those 79 programs that could be addressing the adult literacy program?

Chairman HAWKINS. Theoretically, yes, they could, but they could address other activities, and they were primarily designed for other functions. And you could add the same amount for these other functions, and say that that amount is being spent on some other function. In other words, you could use the same dollars six or seven times.

So it is obvious that it should not be all credited to literacy, because their primary function may be something else. Vocational education, for example, is a very substantial amount of it, but vocational education does not ordinarily get involved in literacy training. It may get involved in vocational training, but not necessarily literacy training. And that is the misrepresentation to which I referred.

I will give you a copy of the report, and I hope that you will have an opportunity to analyze it. And if there is any further clarification that is needed, then we can instruct the staff to go back and review some further ramification of it that may be of interest to this committee.

But I am simply suggesting that let us not believe everything that is being said in support of the some of the allegations of those who would like to cut the funding which is their main purpose and not in literacy training.

Mr. Williams has vanished. Mr. Solarz.

Mr. SOLARZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Do you any of you know what the functional definition of illiteracy is for an adult?

Mr. MURPHY. It has moved around so much in my twenty-five years in this business. There is no real definition at this point. And people have tried to set an absolute illiterate level, and then a functional illiterate level over that. They have used the adult performance level study at one time, and looked at a number of competencies. Some people use grade levels.

At this point, in our program it does not matter that much to us that we can define the point at which illiteracy ends and literacy begins. If people are in need of basic education, that is it.

Mr. SOLARZ. In terms of measuring the magnitude of the problem, would it make sense to try to establish a national standard of literacy in order to be able not only to determine who is illiterate and who is not, but how many people fall into the illiterate category.

I am not suggesting that just because someone might meet the technical definition of illiteracy, whatever that definition is, that they do not need help.

But to the extent that we are concerned about the problem of adult illiteracy in the country, do you think that it would be helpful to have some nationally established standard of what illiteracy is?

Mr. MURPHY. It is a way of defining the problem, but it is still difficult. We do have the figure on the number of people without a high school diploma.

Mr. SOLARZ. That does not mean that they are illiterate.

Mr. MURPHY. No, it does not.

Mr. SOLARZ. Given the fact that there appear to be several definitions of illiteracy, what are the varying estimates as to the number of adult illiterates in the nation?

Mr. MURPHY. They vary from 19 to 23 million in the conservative range, and those are people functioning generally about the fifth or fourth grade down or limited English proficient. And there have been estimates looking at the APL study and classifying both levels of going up into the 50 millions.

Mr. SOLARZ. Are there any estimates as to how many literally cannot read at all, not even first grade level?

Mr. MURPHY. Nothing reliable. I have seen estimates, but nothing that has been any more than a guess.

Mr. SOLARZ. I gather that by any standard, there are many more people who are illiterate than who are getting served by the variety of programs that we have for them.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. Even taking the most conservative estimate of 19 million, we have got about 2.9 million being served in the country this year.

Mr. SOLARZ. What do you find tends to happen when people who were illiterate go into these programs and acquire the skills necessary to become literate? Do you find that in the great percentage of such cases that people get jobs that they did not have previously or are able to lead better lives? Is there a clear correlation between their subsequent compared to their prior status in society?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, I believe that for the great majority that there is. They come for different reasons. Some only to help their children and some to read the Bible. A good half of them do come for economic purposes. And then it depends on whether or not you set your program up so that it works closely with other programs that can get them into training.

Mr. SOLARZ. Let me ask you a final question. Perhaps the others might want to answer this as well. I have always been impressed by the fact that there have been some countries in the developing world, particularly where revolutions have overthrown the previous power structure, in which one of their first undertakings is to organize a literacy campaign where they get a lot of the young people of the country who are in school to go out to the countryside and teach adults who never learned how to read and write to do so.

I realize that there are conflicting assessments as to how effective these programs are. God knows that countries like Cuba and Nicaragua who have done this have pretty poor human rights efforts. But nevertheless, I have always thought that that was at least one commendable aspect of their revolutions.

Even if these programs were not all that successful, the very fact that the effort was made seemed to be a plus. I will leave aside the questions of the extent to which there may have been propagandistic components to such literacy drives which may be objectionable.

But I mention this as a prelude to asking would it make any sense in our country to try to organize a national literacy campaign in which we would undertake to encourage college and possibly high school students throughout the country, obviously in some kind of coordinated way, to participate on a volunteer basis in an outreach effort to teach adult illiterates how to read and write. Is there a lesson that we perhaps can learn from these developing countries that have tried such an approach?

Ms. BALLARD. May I respond?

Mr. SOLARZ. Certainly.

Ms. BALLARD. Because the effort of ALIP is exactly what you are describing. It has not zeroed in on college students necessarily. But to use as an illustration one of our programs where our goal was to help people to learn to read the newspaper. And so our efforts were directed to just helping them to read the newspaper, so that they could know what was going on around them.

And in our evaluation of the results following that, they were more prepared to vote, to be a part of the political scene, because they could read the issues and understand them better. And this was a year's program carried out strictly by volunteers where they met with a group of people.

And the goal of that program was to have them to read the newspaper. And then the evaluation had to do with what happened to those people as a result of their being able to read the newspaper on a daily basis.

And it was a completely different attitude on their part, a different feeling about their inclusion. Whether they actually got involved or not, they felt that they at least knew what was going on, and they had the right to be included if they wished.

Mr. SOLARZ. That sounds exciting.

Mr. Murphy, you have tens of thousands of students in New York State at the State University System and other colleges. It seems to me that many of them have idealistic inclinations. I would think that there is a vast reservoir of potential assistance here, which if it were tapped and channeled in the right direction, could be helpful.

What do you think of that? Has it been tried? If it has not, would it make sense to try? Should we encourage it in some way?

Mr. MURPHY. It was tried to a small extent a couple of years ago through the, I cannot think of the name of it, the cooperative work study program money for students, but it was tried to a very small extent.

The major problem is the length of time that they would be able to devote to this. If you are looking at literacy as a Third World nation might, which is rudimentary literacy commendable and doable in a short period of time, that is one thing.

If you are looking at the fact that to stay competitive, we may have to go into work places and get people functioning at the eighth and ninth grade level across the board in order to deal with the new technologies and the new less hierarchical systems of management, that a one time big push effort misses that population, and you need an organized ongoing effort to do that kind of thing. So a one time big push of volunteers may have a role, but it is not a solution to the whole range of literacy.

Mr. SOLARZ. Well, let me just say that there is no reason in principle that it has to be one time. Why could it not be continuing?

If you tell me that we are serving maybe ten percent of the number of the adult illiterates in the country through the existing program, and we recognize that budgetary constraints make it impossible to have a massive expansion of these programs, what is the objection to harnessing volunteer efforts in an effort to deal with the problem? Is that not better than doing nothing?

Mr. MURPHY. There is no objection whatsoever, except to point out that it is one part of an overall solution. And one other thing that needs to be pointed out is that cost figures have shown over the last two or three years in which volunteers have been given a lot of support, that volunteers have not been that much cheaper than regular classrooms.

The training and the logistics have shown, and I am getting this from the volunteer agencies, that it costs almost as much to run a volunteer set-up as it does to run a regular classroom type of program. If that is the case, then what is being looked at as a very cost effective mechanism for getting out to a lot of people may not be.

The other problem is that there are about 50,000 volunteers in the business now. Our ability to increase that ten- or twenty-fold, I am not sure of it. But as I said in my testimony, we use everybody that we can because it makes sense, and we would welcome that kind of an initiative.

Mr. SOLARZ. Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just talk for a moment about who is in need—and the level of service they need. If we just take for an example a city like Los Angeles which by one reasonably finite measurement has some 40,000 people on various waiting lists seeking programs which will help them acquire an important skill, or to upgrade one.

Granted that is a diverse population. But if we just use that kind of target and we talk about the range of delivery systems that we have available and the need to have a useful blend of support for those delivery systems.

If we were to target our effort at that self-selected population for instance those individuals who have placed themselves on a waiting list, where would we best target our resources in order to meet that in your experience?

Mr. MURPHY. The self-selected, the 40,000 on the waiting list?

Mr. SAWYER. Right.

Where do we find those waiting lists most intensively concentrated and what kinds of support can we best give to meet that most highly motivated need of an entire and large population that needs help?

Mr. MURPHY. The best way to handle it is to have a coordinated intake system in a neighborhood or in a city which looks at the people and the slots that you have available in all kinds of programs, and also the kinds of situation that they are looking for.

You are going to get some people who just will not come out to anything but the tender loving care and the intimacy of a volunteer setting, and others will want to come to a class with their friends. Some like the prestige of a college, and some like to go to the school down the street, and some like to go to the library.

And we have to sort all of that out, and as best as possible get people in the right places. So clearly, if you are going to have to mount something in a hurry, a classroom based system is the quickest up, because you are talking one to ten, one to twelve, and one to fifteen. When if you are talking volunteer, you are talking one to one. And you have got to identify and train as many volunteers as you have got candidates.

Mr. SAWYER. Are you telling me that every situation and every self-selected population is so different that we, as a Congress, cannot begin to choose among those delivery systems that are most effective? Is the situation so different in every setting; whether we are talking about Los Angeles, or New York, or Columbus, Ohio, or Ames, Iowa, that we simply throw up the dollars and let the dollars sort themselves out?

My question is, from your experience, in order to meet the largest number of that unmet population, in order to do the best job that we can with the dollars that we have, does your experience tell you that we ought to direct ourselves in a particular direction,

or is it simply that every delivery system is so necessary that we cannot choose among them?

Mr. MURPHY. My tendency would be to set objectives for the money, but not in terms of selecting a delivery system, and let the states put together what makes sense. For example, every state has a primary delivery system, and then it is sorted by the others.

But in some states like mine, it is the public schools. Historically for over a hundred years, it has been the public schools. In other states, it is the community college system. In some states, it is the voc tech system. The libraries and the volunteers tend to be support in all states.

But they have their role. And I would not recommend anything that says this is our best bet and we are going with this one. Because states differ and people differ, and I believe that a pluralistic system is manageable.

In New York City, I have got about fifty community based organizations that are superb deliverers of service. I do not want to lose them. But still 80 percent of what I am doing in New York City is in the schools. But those CBOs get to a population through their identity with those groups that sometimes the schools cannot get to.

So it takes a real mix and match and patchwork quilt of effort to do it, and I would not have it any other way.

Mr. SAWYER. One more question, Mr. Chairman.

Where in New York City do you have your longest waiting lists?

Mr. MURPHY. At the moment, it is in Brooklyn and the Bronx.

Mr. SAWYER. No, the kind of program.

Mr. MURPHY. English as a second language are more likely to be self-selected and queue up on a waiting list than native speakers of English. Yet at the same time, we realize that if we are going to do something with this money that we have to reach out aggressively for them as well. We cannot just take the self-selected.

Because we can run a lot of classes, but we may not be arraying the money that we have out to deal with all of the problems that we have got out there in the community. We have to make some judgments on that.

But on the last reckoning that we did, we had 8,000 English as a second language people on a waiting list out of the about the 70,000 that we have in the city presently in programs.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Ballard, as you have testified about the community based effort that you have which provides services complementary to that of the regular education institutions, you went through a number of accomplishments and I suppose requirements of any group such as yours.

I have noted three of them. One is that you say that there is a need that all students need a continuous ego strengthening. Another is that your group helps remove the uniquely imposed root causes of illiteracy; for example, a bad self-image. That you have to try to influence in a positive way a community's lack of insightfulness.

Granted that all of those are appropriate pre-conditions to an aggressive willingness to learn on the part of any of our citizens, but give me a sense of how much of the time of your group is spent in doing those necessary things, and what percentage of the time is spent on hands-on literacy training?

Ms. BALLARD. Well, since I indicated that ours is a supplementary program, I would say that perhaps 75 percent of the time goes into the ego strengthening and the other items that you mentioned, and 25 percent goes into actually working with helping to raise the level.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the individuals who are involved in the 25 percent of the hands-on education experience, are those people teachers?

Ms. BALLARD. For the most part. Now a number of the organizations in this coalition do consist of professional educators. The black teachers sorority has always played a major role in this program. And the co-chairman on education comes from that group. In my own organization, the majority of our members are professional educators.

They still as they design the hands-on program work with community efforts and work through the formalized school program, so that they are not working adversely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the legislation that I am preparing, we do have a directive that in the state plan that the state must demonstrate ways in which it encourages activity with groups such as yours. So that would be a requirement. Although my bill on the reauthorization has not yet been introduced, let me share a couple of facts about it with both of you.

Under the Act, states and localities would be required to coordinate in an even closer way than they do now with other federal sources. And that includes coordination with a new group that I have legislated into law last year, and that is a Vista Literacy Corps, which is Vista people involved around the country in hands-on experience with illiterate people.

States are permitted under this legislation which we will introduce soon to use a portion of their funds to assist the private sector adult education initiatives.

And a third thing that you both might perhaps be interested in is that the state and local recipients are required to recognize the special needs of persons with disabilities and persons with limited English proficiency. And although our friend, Mitch Snyder, had to leave to go about his good work, they are also required to recognize the homeless.

Let me say finally that setting aside, if anyone interested in this country can possibly set aside these important matters, but setting aside for a moment that illiteracy is a terrible blot on democracy, because our representative democracy only works with a literate citizenry, that this great experiment of ours fails without a literate citizenry, setting aside that need for literacy, that is a well educated citizenry, and setting aside the danger to America's defense of an illiterate people, and looking at only as many in Washington do now about the costs.

I am on the House Budget Committee, and we were here at midnight last night trying to complete work on the current year's

budget. So let us just look at it through the green eye shade that many people consider all of these matters with in these times of difficult deficit.

It is estimated that last year it cost the American taxpayer $6.6 billion to keep illiterates in jail. Not of course because they were illiterates, that was not their crime, but illiteracy certainly helped pave their way to the problems that cost you $6.6 billion to keep them incarcerated.

We estimate that last year the cost of welfare and unemployment directly related to illiteracy was another $6 billion. Business men and women have come to this committee and said that illiteracy cost them $10 billion.

If we are really going to move this budget toward balance and if we are going to make correct use of your hard earned tax dollars, we have to move much more dramatically than we have been in reducing dramatically the rate of illiteracy in the United States. Hopefully, that is what our bill will continue to try to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. I wish to thank the witnesses for their appearance before the committee. I think that the testimony is helpful to the committee, and I certainly want to commend both of you on the fine job that you are doing in your local communities, and I hope that we can match it by doing a job on this committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if I might.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Even though Mitch Snyder had to leave, I want to relate very quickly, Mr. Chairman, a story. Mitch Snyder runs a kind of a nationally famous center not many blocks from here. And he mentioned that Chairman Bill Gray of the Budget Committee and several of us went down there a few days ago.

During that tour, I said to Mitch Snyder how do these people get around, do they have public transportation? He said something that shocked me. I should have known better, but it shocked me. He said, well, the buses pull up out here in the morning. I said, well, where do they take these people. Well, he said in a kind of surprised manner, they take them to work. I said, to work? He said, of course, a lot of these people work.

I said, well, what are they doing in this homeless shelter, why did you have to bring them in off of the grates if they work? Well, he said, Pat, they work at the minimum wage three hours a day two days a week. That is the best that they do. The only place in town that they can afford are the grates at that wage. The buses also take other people out for job interviews, but the great problem, Congressman, is that too many of them are illiterate, and they cannot get and hold good jobs. But are they working, many of them? Yes. Are most of the rest of them looking for work? Yes.

Now unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we hear from this Administration that these people cannot work or will not work, that they do not want to work, and that in fact many of them want to live on the streets. The facts are the total reverse of that.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, I think that it is a true comment in that we are talking about adult illiterates. But we also have a system in this country of compulsory public education. And you wonder why it is that so many people who were born and came up.

And we are not talking about farmers. We are talking about native born individuals, the majority of whom are white. That they become illiterates.

And yet possibly the greatest cause of it is that 82 percent of the children of America do not have pre-school education. Some 60 percent are denied Chapter I. And yet they end up becoming illiterate. And we do not stop to think that it begins at birth for many of these individuals, and we simply neglect them.

So they end up with you trying to help them in New York and patch up what has been done. And the Assault on Literacy organization trying to patch up what we fail to do early in the process. And we go on, and on and on. And in the meantime, some more than two million join illiteracy every year, and a million drop out of school obviously illiterate. We have immigrants coming into this country obviously illiterate and what now.

And so the job is becoming so big that not only the cost is escalating, but all of the other problems attendant to illiteracy also. Even our national security is threatened.

So the subject that we are talking about today is not an insignificant one. And certainly, we want to commend the witnesses for the job that they are doing to help us out.

Thank you. That concludes the hearing.

[Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m, the subcommittee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Additional material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

W. WILSON GOODE
MAYOR

April 9, 1987

Congressman Augustus Hawkins
Subcommittee on Elementary,
Secondary and Vocational Education
Rayburn House Office Building
Room B346C
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Hawkins:

I am pleased that I have been asked to submit testimony to the Subcommittee on the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. As you may know, I am Chair of the Literacy Task Force of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, as well as Chair of that organization's Subcommittee on Education. Additionally, Philadelphia has the most comprehensive adult literacy program in the nation. Headed by a senior person on my staff, the Mayor's Commission on Literacy has provided local, regional, national and international leadership on this important social issue. Because literacy is a priority for my Administration, I believe that it is important to bring the plight of those lacking basic skills to greater national attention.

I appreciate the opportunity for my remarks to be part of the public record. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

W. Wilson Goode

W. WILSON GOODE
MAYOR

WWG:dd

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

W. Wilson Goode, Mayor, City of Philadelphia

Chair, Subcommittee on Education, U.S. Conference of Mayors

Illiteracy and the American Adult

Many citizens in our nation -- unemployed, underemployed, career displaced and immigrants -- lack the basic skills necessary to function in everyday life. They cannot understand the warning on a medicine bottle, fill in a job application, or read to their children. These adults are referred to as functionally illiterate. They are excluded from participation in the mainstream of our society and economy, and they can be found in every state of the union. They live in urban centers, towns, and rural areas. The quality of their lives, their children's lives, and the lives of all Americans is enormously affected by their situation.

No one knows for certain the numbers of those having this handicap. Determining a person's level of literacy is difficult; high school graduation is a poor indicator because, until recently, there have been no uniform minimum graduation standards. Surveys also yield ambiguous results because many readers are too embarrassed to acknowledge their condition. Low level readers sometimes carry newspapers in their pockets to feign literacy; others don't venture far from home because they can't read the signs on buses. Because of the social stigma attached to illiteracy, these adults have become a huge, voiceless minority with no institutionalized base of support.

Adult illiteracy is a contributing factor in many of the severe social problems we as a nation face; it has been positively correlated with joblessness, welfare dependency, crime, and drug usage. While specific causal relationships cannot be conclusively established between illiteracy and each of these social problems, illiterates remain disproportionately represented in every one of these categories. By resolving to combat the problem of illiteracy, our nation will lay the groundwork for ameliorating many of the other problems with which we are afflicted.

Broadening our efforts against illiteracy today will have positive ramifications in the future. Research has demonstrated that a child's ongoing, personal contact with a literate adult in the home is the key factor in predicting a child's performance in reading at school. Thus immediate concentrated action on the problem of illiteracy through expansion of the Adult Education Act will help to break the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy that has trapped so many Americans.

Literacy and a Competitive America

As is well-known, our nation's economy is shifting from its traditional manufacturing base to high-tech information intensive industries. The demand for skills grows ever more pronounced as society becomes more technologically-oriented and complex. Few employers can accommodate workers deficient in basic reading, language, and computational skills. A mismatch is growing between the skills demanded by corporate America and those offered by the workforce, to the detriment of both.

As this country competes with other nations for preeminence in economic performance, a determining factor in maintaining our technological edge is a literate workforce. Representative Augustus Hawkins recognized this relationship when he introduced H.R. 4728 last May, which addressed the connection between

functional illiteracy and the ability of the United States to compete effectively in the international arena. The bill proposes to authorize a program in which state education agencies would receive funds to provide basic skills to those who need them -- enhancing their employability or enabling them to find new jobs and learn skills consonant with technological change.

Noteworthy initiatives have been taken by several American corporations in recognition of the link between literacy and competitiveness. The CIGNA Corporation, B. Dalton Bookseller, McGraw-Hill Publishers, Inc., and IBM are just a few examples of businesses which have made a major commitment to literacy through large financial or in-kind contributions. Harold W. McGraw, Jr., President & CEO of McGraw-Hill Publishers, has made a personal commitment by chairing the Business Council for Effective Literacy, an alliance of businesses working to highlight the interest corporate America has in a literate population.

Exciting public/private venture precedents have been set. But American business has never and cannot be expected in the future to assume full responsibility for the education of our adult population. The national agenda for education and hence economic competitiveness will inevitably be determined by the federal government's commitment.

The Existing Literacy Service Network

Estimates of the number of Americans lacking basic skills range from 23 to 72 million; whatever the exact figure, only 5 % are receiving regular, ongoing instruction. Services are provided through a network of literacy agencies, the most significant of which are funded by the Adult Education Act. School districts, community colleges, libraries, organizations such as Laubach Literacy and Literacy Volunteers of America, community-based agencies, and churches comprise the bulk of the network. Services include Adult Basic Education, English as a Second Language instruction and practice for the GED (the high school equivalency certificate). Professor David Harman of Columbia University, a nationally acknowledged expert on adult education, has estimated that with proper support, these existing services can be expanded to accommodate an additional 5-10 million people.

According to Harman, the current system does not represent a coherent network of literacy instruction for adults. It reaches only those students who happen to live in areas where literacy instruction is offered, those reached by limited outreach efforts, or those who are sufficiently motivated to find programs on their own. Thus, those adults most in need of basic skills often go without services.

Further, the system is stressed by high dropout rates among adult students, due in part to uncertainties in their lives. Volunteer tutors, while providing the reduced-cost support necessary for many programs to exist, need high levels of support and training in order to function effectively as literacy instructors. It is very important to note that these volunteer programs require dollars!

In order to expand learning opportunities for millions more to be reached, greatly increased funding is imperative to provide materials, technology, space and instructional training.

Recent Literacy Initiatives

Public awareness of the literacy problem has been raised recently through the efforts of two major broadcasting corporations, ABC and PBS. PLUS, Project Literacy U.S., is designed to educate viewers through television on the dimensions of the problem, as well as provide means for interested tutors and students to come foward. PLUS works with local literacy programs nationwide to refer volunteers and those in need of services.

The PLUS initiative was undertaken in recognition of the need for greater literacy services nationwide; however, when the program was begun, the established literacy service community was already stretched thin, with many programs lacking the resources to handle the already waiting lines of tutors and students. On the whole, the PLUS campaign has been highly successful in meeting its goals of raising awareness and increasing the numbers of students and tutors involved in literacy instruction. But to help the network expand to meet the increased demand, new funding is needed.

Conclusion: Civic Literacy

Literacy has two facets: one, the posession of the basic skills necessary to function effectively in everyday situations, such as reading traffic signs and shopping for groceries; and the other, the ability to comprehend, analyze and evaluate subtle concepts and arguments. This latter ability is essential for the full and effective participation of all Americans in our political process.

This year we are celebrating the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution. Yet, for those who lack the skills to read the seminal document of our democracy, opportunity is limited. The ability to make informed choices, to vote intelligently, to detect propaganda requires more than basic literacy. To meet this challenge, a commitment to raise the educational status of the nation's adults must be forged by the leadership of our country. Resources must be provided so that the literacy problem can be meaningfully addressed and the possibilities of liberty and democracy may be fully realized by all of our citizens. To do less consigns our nation to governance by the haves, while the have nots, those who cannot participate, remain a voiceless minority, unable to persuasively articulate their grievances, offer their suggestions or register their choices. We must do more to ensure that these individuals fully avail themselves of the opportunities which our form of goverment guarantees.

Institutionalized commitments to research, funding, and direction are required to reach the tens of millions of adults who need help. The investment, while costly, will pay enormous dividends in terms of our nation's economic vitality and social cohesion. Jefferson warned that a nation cannot be both ignorant and free; his warning takes on a special urgency today.

TESTIMONY OF NICHOLAS M. NIKITAS

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

PRESENTED TO

THE ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE,

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

THE HONORABLE AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, CHAIRMAN

MARCH 26, 1987

Good morning Mr. Chairman. As you know, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education was created by the Congress under PL 91-230 as amended in 1970 to be an independent agency charged with the responsibility to evaluate the effectiveness and recommend new measures to the President, the Congress and the Department of Education to resolve the crisis of adult illiteracy in America.

In late 1986, the Council released its much-acclaimed report "Illiteracy in America: Extent, Causes and Suggested Solutions." Thus far in 1987, the NACAE has held public hearings on the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act in four national regions: Newark, NJ; Nashville, TN; Denver, CO; and Seattle, WA.; and on April 1 in Los Angeles, CA. Throughout our hearings we have taken testimony from scores of state directors, local program directors, directors of non-profit programs, volunteers and students. We have uncovered some very interesting and significant information from the field and therefore are most honored to present these findings to this Committee of the Congress this morning:

The Act

There is much confusion among our populace as to the title "Adult Education Act." Therefore the NACAE recommends that the title should be changed to "Adult Basic Education Act" to avoid confusion with other continuing programs at the local level.

Categorical Levels

When the Act was passed in the 1960's, there were three equivalency levels of ABE: Level 1 was intended for those with 0 - 4 capability, level 2 for grades 5-8 equivalency; and level 3 was intended to train those with an equivalency of grade level 9 and above. Under the reform of the 1970's, levels 1 and 2 were combined into a new level 1 for 0 - 8 and level 2 remained the same for grade 9 and above. This change has effectively allowed state and local agencies to expend most of the earmarked dollars for the new level 1 at the top half of its spectrum. The NACAE favors the return to the previous levels of funding so as neither to encourage nor to allow program deliverers to save time and labor by teaching only the more easily educable students in the top half of level 1. A return to the original three-tiered system would insure that those most in need of basic skills, those most difficult to teach, will receive the training and that programs can more easily be held accountable. It is the NACAE's recommendation that the ESL programs also be divided in three tiers: ie. beginner, intermediate, and advanced. The NACAE believes that this reform will reverse the trend of the quantity of students passing through each program as a measure of success, back to the quality of the training provided the students most desperately in need.

Maintenance of Effort

Most state directors of adult basic education view the "maintenance of effort" provisions of the act as a legislated incentive to distort and deceive. In anticipation of regional economic downturns, most states deliberately underreport the actual state and local commitment to ABE programs so as not to be penalized by a reduction in federal funding. While this practice cannot be allowed to continue per se, the impact on accurate data collection, program evaluation and effectiveness, and long range planning is catastrophic.

No serious effort to reducing illiteracy can be undertaken without the most accurate data collected from the field. Removal of the maintenance-of-effort provision can help the state directors and the US Dept of Education to quantify the depth of our crisis and the scope of existing programmatic effectiveness.

Duplication of Effort (Sec 309)

Because of the heightened public and political awareness of the crisis of illiteracy, the NACAE believes that new legislation and its concomitant duplication of effort is precisely what is not needed. The US Deptartment of Education should be encouraged to undertake a competitive state by state audit of existing programs, human and capital commitments, and a current and future needs assessment. We have previously described some of the legislative impediments to such investigation, but there is one legislative incentive that we believe should be included in the reauthorization of the act: a targeted state by state performance contract in the form of a federal report card on any state's comparative effectiveness with other states and the punitive denial of federal funding should any states not fully cooperate.

Student Progress (Sec 306)

There must be some objectivized means to assess individual student progress. Many students who can never hope to benefit from the program must continue to be served under current guidelines. Local discretion for periodic reassessment is important to determine whether or not a student can or should be retained. We repeatedly heard in testimony before us that the presence of these students is a definite disincentive for other students who want to learn and it often leads directly to increasing the dropout rate and even denying seats to students who yearn to learn.

Curriculum Development

There must be an incentive at the national level to encourage the research and development of new curricula. The current state and local bureaucracy is both fearful of destabilizing change and is frankly too overworked to undertake such a project. The NACAE believes that attention must be given to information age computer technology to break away from the labor intensity of one-to-one training and move to group training of perhaps 30 or 40 to one if we are to make any headway against the ever rising cost of our adult illiterate populations.

Phonics - The NACAE believes that the use of phonics in teaching reading should be encouraged over the "look - say" method. Since 1911, the phonics method has been more effective in all 124 studies undertaken.

Bilingual - Any reference to or adherence to the bilingual method of training should be removed from the act in favor of the more widely successful and time-effective methods of English As a Second Language.

Inter-agency Agreements

There must be horizontal cooperation between governmental agencies on each step of the vertical delivery system: ie. Immigration & Naturalization Service with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Defense Department on the federal level or drug and alcohol clinics and private industry councils on the local level.

Competition - the NACAE believes that there must be some federally based competition among the states and locally based competition within the states injected into the delivery process. Requests for proposals must be given equal weight for private and non-profit providers without the turfing fear of losing the authority of the LEA's if we are to seriously attack the crisis.

State Advisory Councils

The NACAE has found that wherever state advisory councils have been the most broadly representative of public, private, and non-profit adult basic education service providers, the programs are the most exemplary. The NACAE believes that whenever and wherever the services are the most integrated, both quantity and quality are most certain to increase. States should also encourage local advisory councils to act as clearing houses for print materials, computer hard and soft ware, books, library resources, data collection, legislative advocacy, hotline access, and networking among all providers. By this means of shared local resources and responsibility, the NACAE believes strongly that service delivery can be most fully integrated and effective.

Conclusion

Though heightened public awareness is essential, it bears its own new set of problems. The number of players has so multiplied that we must be ever mindful not to diffuse effort.

Political pressure for "pride of authorship" legislation must be avoided at all cost if we are to improve existent institutional commitments on the short range. In order to avoid any temporal or quick-fix solutions, the NACAE recommends that a federal study be undertaken to assess all elements of current need and a projection for the resolution of the crisis of adult illiteracy under a strategic master plan for the next 20 years. We have already created a 20-year infrastructure and the pool of illiterates has continued to increase.

Let us eliminate any planning set asides and other process impediments to adult basic education.

Let us encourage our public and private universities to train more students in ABE and ESL and offer them degree credit hours as student interns.

Let us encourage the use of local libraries not only as input clearing houses on literacy resources but as output centers of ABE and ESL training.

Let us encourage year-round training as a more consistent delivery system to reduce the high ABE dropout rate.

Let us all work in concert to reform our K-12 public education system - to analyze the demands of the new family in the new America - to paint with the creative freedom of artists to invest in America's greatest asset - her people. For as Edward Everett once said: "An educated populace is a better safeguard of liberty than even a standing army."

Mr. Chairman, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education unanimously supports reauthorization.

Adult Education Act Reauthorization
Survey Report

This report is submitted to Congress by the Life Skills Division of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education.

It represents our attempt to establish a data base for addressing four issues concerning the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act.

Submitted by
Patricia M. Keeton
Legislative Representative
AAACE, Life Skills Division
March 26, 1987

The questionaire was mailed to 46 members of AAACE representing Adult Education Act programs. **Twenty-four** responded--an exceptional rate (52%) for a mail survey with a short deadline. (See attached)

All areas of the country are represented by these responses:

- West = 37%
- Midwest = 9%
- Southeast = 25%
- Northeast = 29%

The variety of positions in the field of adult education were included in the survey design. The response reflects this variety. State administrators, local program directors, teacher trainers, and members of the research community all responded in equal amounts to the survey.

In addition, responses include representation of the AAACE Units most concerned with the Adult Education Act: Teachers of Adult Education, English as a Second Language programs, Adult Basic Education programs, and Competency-Based Education programs.

Survey Results

In response to the question of including the attainment of **competencies** as a purpose of the Adult Education Act, an overwhelming majority (83%) **support** this addition. Two respondents question whether basic skills and competencies are not the same. Both feel, however, that the term **competency** is appropriate.

Concerning the required state and local funding match, almost **two-thirds** of the respondents **favor an increase.** Specifically, 40% support a 25% match and 26% encourage a 50% match over time. The remaining 34% support the current requirement. There appears to be some concern that an increased matching requirement would fall disproportionately (and unfairly) on local programs.

Respondents are **equally divided** on the issue concerning the duplication of efforts among states' special project investments. Eleven feel that states should be required to fund unique projects. Interestingly, of the 11 respondents who do not agree, 5 have noted that provisions should be made in Section 310 for dissemination and adaption of exemplory projects to other programs.

Four-fifths of the respondents **support** the O.T.A. recommendation that **levels of adult performance** be determined periodically. However, **one third** do not believe that performance survey results alone should be the basis for the state funding formula. One respondent insists that such a survey must be comprehensive in order to assure that accurate data is collected. Another insightful adult educator suggests that "there should be a mixed formula based on performance levels of the adult population **and** performance levels needed for employment in the region."

Name MASTER Position

1. The **Statement of Purpose** (sec. 302, stated below) was written in 1978.

Statement of Purpose

Sec. 302. It is the purpose of this title to expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will--

(1) enable all adults to acquire **basic literacy skills** necessary to function in society,

(2) enable adults who so desire to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school, and

(3) make available to adults the means to secure training and education that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

Should the first purpose include both "**basic skills** and **competencies** necessary to function in society"?

83% Yes 17% No Comments:

2. Since its inception in 1965, the Adult Education Act has only required a 10% match from state/local programs.

Should the reauthorization require: (check **one**)

34% Yes ____ No a. the same 10% match

40% Yes ____ No b. an increase to 25% match

26% Yes ____ No c. an increase to 50% match over a 5 year period

____ Yes ____ No d. other:

3. Since 1975 states have expended $130 million for Section 310 Projects. This section presently requires that states fund projects that involve "the use of innovative methods...or programs which may have national significance..." (See Section 310, printed on back).

Should this section be changed to require that 310 Projects **not** be duplicated (i.e. REINVENTED) from state to state and that they should be worthy of dissemination to other programs?

50% Yes ____ No Comments: _____

Use of Funds for Special Experimental Demonstration Projects and Teacher Training

Sec. 310. Of the funds allotted to a State under section 305 for a fiscal year, not less than 10 per centum shall be used for--

(1) special projects which will be carried out in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and which--

(A) involve the use of innovative methods, including methods for educating persons of limited English-speaking ability, systems, materials, or programs which may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title, or

(B) involve programs of adult education, including education for persons of limited English-speaking ability, which are part of community school programs, carried out in cooperation with other federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs which have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of persons with educational deficiencies; and

(2) training persons engaged, or preparing to engage, as personnel in programs designed to carry out the purposes of this title.

4. The state grant-formula is based solely on the proportion of adults in a state who never finished high school.

A 1986 study by the **Office of Technology Assessment of the U.S. Congress** recommends that the Department of Education conduct a survey of **performance levels** every three years.

81% Yes 19% No a. Should the act require that periodic studies of performance levels be conducted?

68% Yes 32% No b. Should the survey results then be the basis for the funding formula?
Comments: _____